

Impossible Conference in Stockholm

Robert Faurisson

May 22, 1993.

My name is Robert Faurisson. I am 64 years old. We are today the 22 of May 1993. I am in Stockholm at the end of a difficult day. This afternoon I was supposed to give a conference in Stockholm in a private place to some people interested by revisionism. But it wasn't possible. When, with my friend Ahmed Rami, I got near the place we were attacked by some hooligans who had their face hidden and I was told that those people had stones and knives. We received on our car one stone, on the window. It did not break. We had to leave. It was impossible for me to give this conference.

As I got back home I got a phone-call from France and I learn that yesterday, on the 21, something had been published in France saying that a Jewish organisation, a fighting Jewish organisation call Betar had decided to stop me from entering in your country. And they decided to stop me. They said even by force, by physical violence. They didn't do it at Arlanda airport, because I arrived two days ago. But they stopped me from talking on the 22 of May.

When, on the 20 of May, I arrived at Arlanda airport I was for the first time received in this country as a normal human being. This had not been the case on the 17 of Mars 1992, where I was stopped by the police. It was not the case in December 1992 where the police stopped me once more. This time I had no trouble with the police, no trouble with the custom. And I saw my friend Ahmed Rami. Some journalists were there. And especially a lady from *Expressen*.

They asked me: "Why are you coming to Sweden?". And I said: "For two reasons. First, to visit my friend Ahmed Rami who invited me. Second, because I want an answer to my challenge to the Swedish media." And I was asked: "What was your challenge?" I said: On the 17 of Mars, I said to the Swedish media: I have a challenge for you: Please, show me or draw me a Nazi gas chamber. Because, since 1960, since the time I became interested in the problem of the Nazi gas chambers I have never seen a gas chamber, even at Auchwitz. I have never seen a plan. I have never seen a model, a convincing model with technical explanations of those extraordinarily chemical slaughter houses. I am ready to say, the Nazi gas chamber existed. But please describe what it could look like. I have never seen this. When you knew that it was supposedly gas chambers functioning with Zyklon B. When you knew what was Zyklon B. It was a insects acid, invented in 1922 by the Germans and still use today. When you knew how difficult it's to handle this gas. When you knew that you can not get into a place to take out bodies who infected with this gas. And it's extraordinary processes that you can see in a American gas chamber when only one man has been executed, you can not help but being very sceptical about those Nazi slaughter-houses, were 100's or 1000's of people were supposed to be killed and then dragged off this gas chamber. I said on the 17 of Mars 1992: Be careful don't show me a wall. Don't show me a door. Don't show me hair, shoes. I want a total picture of a Nazi gas chamber. And I said: Be careful, you have 24 hours to answer my challenge. But I am going to comment tomorrow night your answers to my challenge.

This challenge was not answered. And not even mentions by the Swedish media. I repeated this challenge in December 1992. And I had another one. And I said: I am ready to meet on the TV, not a journalist, not a politician, but an historian or several historians about what is call the Holocaust. And this challenge was not mention. But you see this time it was rather pleasant for me, I say, to see that I was not insulted on my arrived. And I thought that maybe I could make one or several conference. This was not the case.

We are, I think, pacific people. Asking questions or showing the result of our researches. And I don't see how the fact of answering by insults or by beating up people could be a god answered. Myself since 1968, I have been attacked, oh I use to say 8 times, I am obliged to say today 9 times, because of my ideas. And not even my ideas, but the result of my researches. Because I am not a Nazi. I think that if I were a Nazi I would say it. I am not a criminal. I am not a racist. And I have personal reasons to say that I am not a racist. I am not going to go in to this. I want only to have the right to be curious about things which are strange.

There is an American historian. He is a Jew. His name is Arno Mayer. He is a professor in Princeton. In 1988 he published a book. "Why did the heaven not..." I don't remember the exact title. The real title is: "The final solution in history". On page 362 this Jewish historian, who says that he believes in the Holocaust, has all the same this sentence. And I would like you to think about this sentence. Very short one: "Sources for the study of the gas chambers are at once rare and unreliable." How is it that those sources could be said today, "rare and unreliable". We have been told for years and years that those sources were as numerous as possible. As strong, as reliable as possible. And this man comes and say: No, they are rare and unreliable. And he gives his reasons to say that. He says that we have to be very careful with so call testimonies. Very careful with confessions. And he evens says, certainly at Auschwitz, and perhaps in every other camps, more people, more Jews died from natural causes, than by unnatural causes. By natural causes he means starvation, hard work, epidemics, specially of typhus. And this is why the Germans in there camps had ovens for burn the dead people. We never said that there were no persecutions of the Jews. We never said that there was no deportations, no concentrations camps. All this existed. But we say

that there were no gas chambers to kill people. We have arguments. And if you are interested you should try to see those arguments and to think of them.

Now, you must know that revisionism is nothing of an ideology. It's a method. It's a way of working, of checking, and double-checking things. And I think that we should have the right to express our views. Because I think that most of the Swedes do not know at all what we are talking about. Because what they hear is only the accusation against the revisionists. If the people who are accusing us are so sure, they should be ready to bring us on the TV and to show how ridiculous we are, with our chemical arguments, physical, topographic, I mean the topographic of the camp, architecture arguments, architecture of the crematories, supposed to have had gas chambers, documentary arguments and any historical arguments. You can not judge if you have not heard the accusations and the defence.

Now you could say: But we have heard many witnesses. Do you mean Mr Faurisson that those witnesses are liars? My answer would be: No, I certainly do not say that they are liars. I would say that they are victims of an historical lie. When in your newspaper you read a news which happens to be a false news, and if you repeat it, it doesn't mean that you are a liar. It means that you are a victim of a lie, or of an error, or of a mistake. So I don't say that those people are liars.

Now, do you think that we can find any witness of the gassings? I thought that myself until 1960 when I had my first doubt that there were many witnesses. As you perhaps know I have many many trials in France. And always I asked for a witness to come and to testify and to be examined and cross examined about what he thinks he knows about the gassings. And I can not have even one witness.

Sometimes people come to me and they say: How dare you Mr Faurisson say that the gas chambers did not exist? See my tattoo number. I was in Auschwitz. I was a witness. And I say: Sir or my lady please look at me in the eyes. Do you mean that you have seen a gas chamber? That you have seen a gassing? If this is the case because you have said this, please describe. Every time the answer is: You knew perfectly well that if I have seen a gassing I wouldn't be here to talk to you. They mean, I would have been killed. Now, this is a strange answer. Because first those people presented themselves as witnesses of gassings. And then according to what they say, there can not be a witness. They are wrong. If in Auschwitz you have had those fantastic chemical slaughter houses, functioning day and night for years and years killing 100,000 or millions of people, you would have had many, many witnesses. You must know that Auschwitz was a camp where you had many civilians coming from outside and working into the camp. We have many many documents about Auschwitz. I say millions of documents about those camps. And we have not the slightest proof, material proof that there were any gas chambers. Now you could say something else. You could say: But I have visited Dachau or I have visited Auschwitz and I have seen a gas chamber. I am sorry. If you have visited Dachau, please go back and you will see that the room which is presented as a gas chamber has a sign saying: "Gas chamber, never used". And if you asked the people: But why do you say that it was a gas chamber, never used. They said because the Germans had no time to finish these gas chambers. They began the constructions in 1942 and in 1945 it was not finished. But my question is: "Please tell me what is missing so that we have a gas chamber?" There, anyway, you say that there were no gassings. You say this know. But at the big Nürnberg Trial a film was projected on the 26 of November 1945. And this film showed and described the so called gassing in Dachau. And now we are told that it is false. So what about all the witnesses? The same question for Auschwitz. When you visit Auschwitz you see a room called a gas chamber. But did you have the idea of looking carefully to this place? You could see a tiny little door with a glass. If you had put people to this place. They would have broken the door, broken the glass. And the gas, the dreadful gas, used to kill lice and not people, would have gone to SS-hospital who was 20 meters from there. And this door opens inside in to the place where the bodies supposed to be.

So for those reasons and many others it can not be a gas chamber. And I have myself found the plans. And I can tell you what it was in fact. In fact it had been first a place where you store bodies of people who died from typhus or anything and waiting for burning. And then it was transformed in an air raid shelter.

So please when you see a place called homicidal gas chamber, not delousing gas chamber, asked why do you call this a homicidal gas chamber? What kind of proof do you have?

Let me tell you which is the quiet reason. A few weeks ago I was in Washington, on the 22 of April, for the dedication of the Holocaust memorial museum. And I was waiting for the opening of this Holocaust memorial museum. I was very curious to see what kind of gas chamber they would show. Because my challenge to the Swedish media was in fact an international challenge. And do you know what? In this Holocaust memorial museum, which costs millions of dollars, the gas chamber that you see is a delousing gas chamber, presented as a homicidal gas chamber. It is a gas chamber that you can visit in Majdanek, Poland. And it's not only me who says that, not only me who says that it's a delousing gas chamber. But even the adversaries of the revisionists. And especially Klarsfeld. Mr and Mrs Klarsfeld. He is called the Nazi hunter. He published a book written by a man called Jean-Claude Pressac. On Auschwitz at the end of this book, presented so by a Jewish institution, The Klarsfelds foundation in New York, you have the photo of this Majdanek delousing gas chamber. And it is said that this was a delousing gas chamber.

So it means that in Washington they are showing you, and this is a lie, a disinfecting or delousing gas chamber, as a homicidal gas chamber. In other words, what the Germans had built and used to protect their own health and the health of the prisoners. Because the clothes of the prisoners were disinfected in this place. They show this as something that the Germans would have built and used to kill their prisoners. Now this is really too much.

I think it is time to give my conclusions. We should have the right to ask questions. And not to be insulted. And also I would say something else. I knew that your country received very well Salman Rushdie. Maybe Salman Rushdie tomorrow will be killed. This is possible. He is condemned to death. But myself I am condemned to death by some Jewish organisations, like Betar. A Jewish professor recently said in France: "I would personally kill Faurisson if I could". But he can very easily. Because there is a difference between Salman Rushdie and myself. Salman Rushdie is afraid and he hides himself. I am not afraid. I have even my address and my phone number in the directory of the city of which I live in France. I do not hide myself. I really do not mind. I mind for truth and I don't like very much the truth, because everyone says that he is working for truth and telling the truth. No, I am interested in historical exactitude. I

want to be exact. The name of this man who said that he would be ready to kill Faurisson, he said it on the 14 of December 1992, is Pierre Vidal-Naquet. This man wrote a book call *Assassin of memory*. I am describe as an assassin. Which is a way of saying to the people: You could killed this man. He is nothing more than an assassin.

Now, You must know something. I responded very correctly to this man in 1982, by a book called *Response to Pierre Vidal-Naquet*. And I see that this man today has his book published in United States in English, that he is unable to answer to our arguments and that now he wants to kill us. I don't think that this is fair. So in this country Salman Rushdie was very well received. Myself I was very badly received. I thought that I would say on two occasions among this visits. I am sorry to say, very badly received on three occasions. Because I came in Mars 1992, December 1992. I thought that this time perhaps it would change. It has not changed. This is a pity.

But believe me, people are wondering why I am doing all this. Let me try to answer. I am doing all this because I am not interested in money. I am not interested in honour. I am not interested in publicity. I am not pleased to show my face. I don't like this. I am not interested in politics. I am not interested in religion. So I don't do this against the Jews or for the Nazis. Absolutely not. I am a very curious man. I have what we call intellectual curiosity. I want to go and see things which are supposed to be mysterious, and wich are mysterious. I don't want anyone to stop me. And I want only one thing. And perhaps I should not say this. I would like, not the people of my time to say that I am right or I am courageous. Because I know that they will not say that. My children will not say that. But perhaps my grandchildren will say that. And this is important for me. I want them to say, using the passed tenth: He was courageous. But you see there are different forms of courage. When you have a kind of courage everybody says: Oh splendid, bravo. And they say this is military courage, courage of resistance, of whatsoever. But there is another kind of courage, extremely rare. It's a courage of a man or a woman who fights, keeps on fighting, when everybody spits on him or spits on her. And he wants to fight, and to fight until the end. This is what I'm going to do.

Thank You. This cassette I am told could be broadcast by any radio station. And I am responsible of what I say. Not of what I am supposed to say. Thank you very much.

From a tape with R. Faurisson recorded in Stockholm, 22 May 1993, and displayed on "Radio-Islam" website. Remember it is an oral presentation.

| [Index historia](#) | [Svenska huvudsidan](#) | | [Andra språk](#) |

We have edited some minor mistakes.

First displayed on aaargh: 12 April 2001.

This text has been displayed on the Net, and forwarded to you as a tool for educational purpose, further research, on a non commercial and fair use basis, by the International Secretariat of the Association des Anciens Amateurs de Recits de Guerres et d'Holocaustes (AAARGH). The E-mail of the Secretariat is <[\[email protected\]](#)>. Mail can be sent at PO Box 81475, Chicago, IL 60681-0475, USA..

We see the act of displaying a written document on Internet as the equivalent to displaying it on the shelves of a public library. It costs us a modicum of labor and money. The only benefit accrues to the reader who, we surmise, thinks by himself. A reader looks for a document on the Web at his or her own risks. As for the author, there is no reason to suppose that he or she shares any responsibility for other writings displayed on this Site. Because laws enforcing a specific censorship on some historical question apply in various countries (Germany, France, Israel, Switzerland, Canada, and others) we do not ask their permission from authors living in thoses places: they wouldn't have the freedom to consent.

We believe we are protected by the Human Rights Charter:

ARTICLE 19. <Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.>The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948, in Paris.

[\[email protected\]](#)

| [Accueil général](#) | [Homepage English](#) | [Faurisson Archive](#) | [Archive Faurisson](#) |

You downloaded this document from <<http://aaargh-international.org/engl/FaurisArch/RF930522.html>>